DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 581 CE 005 332

AUTHOR	Hauser, Robert M.; Featherman, David L.
TITLE	White-Nonwhite Differentials in Occupational Mobility Among Men in the United States, 1962-1972.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Center for Demography and Ecology.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Coll. of Agricultural and Life Sciences.
REPORT NO	73-10; VT-102-135
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	44p.; Paper prepared for the meetings of the Population Association of America (New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1973)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; *Employment Patterns; *Males; National Demography; *Occupational Mobility; *Race Influences; Racial Factors; Tables (Data); *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

The paper analyzes and compares trends in the occupational distribution of white and nonwhite men between 1962 and 1972 at ages 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64. The findings suggest that in 1972, as in 1962, the inferior occupational chances of nonwhites are due primarily to their disadvantageous patterns of occupational mobility, rather than to impoverished social origins. Tables displaying the collected data are included. (NJ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113581

Center for Demography and Ecology

The University of Wisconsin - Madison

WHITE-NONWHITE DIFFERENTIALS IN OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AMONG MEN IN THE UNITED STATES, 1962-1972

Robert M. Hauser

David L. Featherman

Working Paper 73-10

(VT 102 135)

March, 1973

Prepared for the meetings of the Population Association of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1973. This research was supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. GI-31604X) and by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Computations were carried out using facilities of the Center for Demography and Ecology by Peter J. Dickinson and Harry P. Travis with the assistance of Hernando Gomez-Buendia. We Wish to thank John M. Bregger for supplying unpublished tabulations of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

CE 005 332

2/3

- 2

ABSTRACT

Intercohort shifts between 1962 and 1972 in the occupation distributions of white and nonwhite men are analyzed and compared at ages 35-44, 45-54 and 55-64. Both white and nonwhite occupation distributions were upgraded over the decade, but among nonwhites the shifts away from the lowest status occupations were expressed partly in increasing rates of absence from the labor force. There are indications of especially rapid shifts in the occupation distributions of nonwhite men at ages 35-44. Among whites and nonwhites intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution can be attributed primarily to changing patterns of movement from first full-time civilian jobs to current occupations, rather than to changing occupational origin distributions or patterns of movement to first jobs. The white and nonwhite occupation distributions did not show a clear pattern of convergence over the decade. They became less similar at ages 35-44 and more similar at older ages. White and nonwhite distributions were most likely to converge in those occupation groups where the share of whites was stable or declining, rather than in groups whose share of the occupation distribution was increasing. Later cohorts of nonwhites would have a much more favorable occupational distribution if they had enjoyed the mobility patterns of whites in earlier cohorts. In 1972 as in 1962 the inferior occupational chances of nonwhites are due primarily to their disadvantageous patterns of occupational mobility, rather than to impoverished social origins.

The use of occupation as an index of social standing requires little defense. Occupational employment is the principal activity of almost all adult males and a substantial minority of females in the U.S., and the importance and constancy of occupational rankings in regard to prestige and socioeconomic status are well-known. A report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights argues, "Advancement up the economic and social scale in our economy depends primarily on access to preferred jobs, and secondarily on control over property" (Ginzberg and Hiestand, 1968:2). In fact the economist Lester Thurow (1972) has characterized the U.S. labor market as functioning under a regime of "competition for jobs" rather than "competition for wages." Likewise, definition of the generation as the span over which mobility may occur rests on well-established sociological practice. To quote Ginzberg and Hiestand again, "No individual, much less a group, is likely to experience substantial changes in fortune and position from one year to the next, even from one quinquennium to the next. Mobility involves generational shifts - from fathers to sons and grandsons."

In March 1962 the Current Population Survey (CPS) supplement, "Occupational Changes in a Generation" (OCG), carried out under the direction of Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, yielded the first definitive measurements of patterns and trends in occupational mobility among U.S. males. Analyses of this survey of 20,700 males aged 20-64 established that there had been substantial upward mobility in the occupational hierarchy between generations. Further, by an ingenious arrangement of OCG, CPS and Census data it was possible to show that more recent

cohorts enjoyed greater opportunities for movement into high status occupations than their predecessors (Blau and Duncan, 1967:90-111; Duncan, 1965). Further analyses of the 1962 data by means of age-constant intercohort comparisons have suggested that improvements in occupational opportunities in the aggregrate have not been accompanied by systematic changes in the rigidity of occupational stratification (Duncan, 1968). That is, there has been no appreciable tightening or loosening of the regime connecting the occupations of men with those of their fathers.

In the past decade there has probably been as much concern about trends toward "rigidification" in American society as in any earlier period. Thus efforts to obtain new readings on trends in occupational mobility are surely in order. Definitive measurements of trend over the decade await the completion of a replication of the OCG survey, which is presently scheduled to be carried out in connection with the March 1973 Current Population Survey (Featherman and Hauser, 1973). However, by adaptation of a procedure used earlier by Duncan (1965), it is possible to obtain indirect evidence of changes in occupational mobility in the past decade.

In an earlier paper we looked at trends in occupational mobility for U. S. men during 1962-1970 without regard to race (Hauser and Featherman, 1973). Our major findings were that there have been net intercohort shifts toward employment as salaried professionals and managers and as skilled manual workers and away from employment as self-employed managers, as farmers, and as nonfarm laborers. Further, those net shifts were primarily a result of changes in patterns of occupational mobility from first jobs to current occupations. That

is, the shifts were not effected by changes in the occupational origins of successive cohorts or by changes in relationships between occupational origins and first jobs.

Our purpose in writing this paper was to compare trends in the occupational mobility of black and white men in the United States from 1962 to 1972. Unfortunately, as of this date the required data from the March 1972 CPS are not yet available, and we have had to content ourselves with the less satisfactory comparison between "whites" and "nonwhites." Since nonwhites other than blacks resemble whites more closely than blacks on many social and economic characteristics, our results probably understate black-white differences. We have been able to replicate our analyses for the period 1962-1970 using both the white-nonwhite and black-nonblack divisions, and the two classifications give similar results.

Relatively little is known about the occupational mobility of black men at any point in time, and still less is known about trends in mobility among blacks. Our knowledge about black-white differences in patterns of occupational mobility rests heavily on the results of the 1962 OCG survey, within which the numbers of blacks sampled were too small to permit reliable trend measurement by means of intercohort comparison. From his analysis of the 1962 black and white mobility matrices Duncan (1968:11) concludes, "Negro men who originated at the lower levels were likely to remain there; white man were likely to move up. Negro men who originated at the higher levels were likely to move down; white men were likely to stay there. Although Negro social origins are not as favorable as those of whites, this is the lesser part of the explanation of racial differences in occupational achievement. The greater part of

the explanation lies in inequalities within the process of mobility itself." Similarly, Lieberson and Fuguitt (1967) demonstrate that the effects of social origins on racial differences in occupations would greatly decrease in a single generation and would almost disappear within about four generations if the patterns of intergenerational mobility of blacks and whites were equated.

Public programs grew during the 1960's which were supposed to improve the opportunities of blacks, and there is some evidence of improvement in the occupation distribution of employed black men during that decade. For example, a report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1972) shows in bright-hued charts how "opportunities for occupational advancement of black workers have been improving.... between 1960 and 1970, the number of black workers in higher-paid and middle-level occupations increased sharply" (p. 2). Farley and Hermalin (1972) report a gradual upgrading of the occupation distribution of both black and white men from 1960 through 1966, followed by large gains for blacks between 1966 and 1970. Thus, the share of black men who would have had to change major occupation categories to equate the black and white distributions fell from 38 percent in 1960 to 36 percent in 1966 and to 31 percent in 1970. The large remaining occupational differences between the races give little ground for complacency among those who would seek equality of achievement between the races.

In our analyses of white-nonwhite differentials in trends of occupational mobility we shall be concerned with the effects of occupational origins on the changing occupation distributions of whites and nonwhites and with the possibility of convergence between the occupational mobility patterns of whites and nonwhites. We begin with an examination by

color of net occupational shifts between selected cohorts from 1962 to 1972. We then analyze these shifts for men of each color in terms of components due to changing social origins, changes in patterns of mobility from occupational origins to first jobs, and changes in mobility from first jobs to current occupations. Next, we look at the color differences in net occupational shifts between cohorts, and we interpret these differential trends in light of the components developed earlier. Finally, we ask whether current patterns of occupational mobility among nonwhites are similar to those prevailing among whites at an earlier point in time.

Methods

Following Duncan's (1965) notation, we let $P = (p_{ij})$ be the transition matrix of an intergenerational occupational mobility table. Then, its elements represent the probability of a son's movement from the i^{th} category of father's occupation to a current occupation in the j^{th} category. Clearly, $\sum_j p_{ij} = 1.0$. Let $A = (a_i)$ be the origin vector of the mobility table, a row vector which gives the proportion of men who originate in the i^{th} occupation class, $\sum_i a_i = 1.0$, and let $C = (c_j)$ be the vector which gives the proportionate distribution of men over destination categories, $\sum_j c_j = 1.0$. Thus, we have the identity, $C = AP$. Likewise, we may also write $C = BQ$, where C is defined as before, while B is the vector of occupations of men in their first full-time jobs, and Q represents the matrix of transition probabilities from first to current jobs.

We use functional notation to identify the vectors and matrices of men in a given cohort observed in a particular year. Thus, C(r,s) is

the occupation distribution of men in the r^{th} cohort in the s^{th} year, and so on. For a selected cohort and year, then, the transition from fathers' to current occupation distributions takes the form $C(r,s) = A(r,s)\ P(r,s)$. From the OCG survey we have estimates of C, A, P, B, and Q for cohorts within ages 20-64 in 1962, and we have later measurements of C from the March 1972 CPS. First full-time civilian occupation and father's occupation at son's age 16 were ascertained in the 1962 OCG supplement, while current occupations were ascertained in the CPS interviews of March 1962 and March 1972.

In order to make inferences about changes over time in P and Q we make the following assumptions: that within the prime working ages mortality and net migration are random with respect to the processes investigated here, and that the quality of data on current occupation, father's occupation, and first job does not vary with age or time. In order to maintain coverage of men in the civilian noninstitutional population we treat "no occupation reported" as a separate category of the origin vectors (father's occupation or first jobs) and "not in the experienced civilian labor force" as a destination category. The latter class includes unemployed men who have never held a job as well as men who are neither employed nor looking for work. There is no category for nonreported current occupations because the U.S. Bureau of the Census allocates occupation titles in such cases by means of a "hot deck" technique.

These assumptions have two pertinent consequences. First, for men born in year r, $A(r,s+t) = A(r,s)$ and $B(r,s+t) = B(r,s)$, where t may be greater or less than zero. This says that we may use the 1962 survey to estimate the origin vectors observed in any year for cohorts covered

in the 1962 survey. Second, the assumptions imply that it is legitimate to compare observed destination distributions across years. Thus, we can make the age-constant intercohort comparison, C(r,s) with C(r+t,s+t). Obviously, our assumptions are not perfectly met, either as to population coverage or response quality, and our inferences are subject to substantial risks of measurement error.

Granting our assumptions, it becomes possible to make inferences about intercohort change in a mobility matrix. Consider the null hypothesis P(r,1962) = P(r+t,1962+t), where we have observed only P(r,1962). This says that the mobility matrix for men aged (1962-r) is unchanged t years later (or earlier). Under the null hypothesis we may write

$$C(r+t,1962+t) = A(r+t,1962+t)\ P(r+t,1962+t)$$
$$\simeq A(r+t,1962+t)\ P(r,1962),$$

which we can estimate by

$$\hat{C}_P(r+t,1962+t) = A(r+t,1962)\ P(r,1962),$$

since A(r+t,1962+t) = A(r+t,1962) by assumption. We denote our estimate of the expected distribution here by $\hat{C}_P(r,s)$ in order to differentiate it from $\hat{C}_Q(r,s)$, the estimate based on the first job vector and the transition from first to current occupation. For example, we can estimate the 1972 occupation distribution (at age 35-44) of men born in 1927-36 (aged 25-34 in 1962) by applying the 1962 intergeneration transition matrix of men born in 1917-26 (aged 35-44 in 1962) to the origin vector of the younger cohort. The same logic applies to hypotheses about intercohort change in the intragenerational mobility matrix. Of course, this procedure is simply an application of the common demographic technique of indirect standardization based on the 1962 occupational mobility rates.

Comparisons among expected and observed distribution for recent years permit us to make limited inferences about change in mobility matrices in the past decade. While identity of destination vectors does not imply identity of transition matrices, differences between destination vectors clearly imply rejection of the null hypothesis (subject to the possibility that internal changes in the matrix are due solely to changes in the marginals and not at all to changes in interactions between rows and columns of the matrix).

In his 1965 paper Duncan used this procedure to measure trends from 1932 through 1962. That is, he applied the 1962 matrix for a younger cohort to the origin distribution of a cohort 10, 20 or 30 years older to obtain an expected occupation distribution of the older cohort when it was 10, 20 or 30 years younger. Following Duncan's proposal (1965: 493-494) that his procedure also be used projectively, we have applied transition matrices for older cohorts to the origin vectors of younger cohorts to obtain expected destination vectors for them in later years.

Using the destination vectors estimated from inter- and intra-generational mobility, it is possible to partition the net intercohort differences in occupation distributions for men of the same age into components attributable to intercohort changes in occupational origins, in the transition from father's occupation to first job, and in the transition from first job to current occupation. The necessary identity is

$$\begin{aligned} C(r+t,s+t) - C(r,s) = {} & [C(r+t,s+t) - \hat{C}_Q(r+t,s+t)] \\ & + [\hat{C}_Q(r+t,s+t) - \hat{C}_P(r+t,s+t)] \\ & + [\hat{C}_P(r+t,s+t) - C(r,s)]. \end{aligned}$$

The two terms in the first bracket on the right differ only because of intercohort differences in the transition matrix from first job to current occupation. That is,

$$C(r+t,s+t) = B(r+t,s+t)\ Q(r+t,s+t),$$

while

$$\hat{C}_Q(r+t,s+t) = B(r+t,s)\ Q(r,s).$$

Thus, since $B(r+t,s) = B(r+t,s+t)$ by assumption, the difference between $C(r+t,s+t)$ and $\hat{C}_Q(r+t,s+t)$ is the effect of intercohort change in the transition from first job to current occupation on the net intercohort difference. To interpret the difference in the second bracket denote the transition matrix from father's occupation to first job as $M(r,s)$. Then

$$P(r,s) = M(r,s)\ Q(r,s),$$

so

$$\hat{C}_P(r+t,s+t) = A(r+t,s)\ M(r,s)\ Q(r,s).$$

Also,

$$\hat{C}_Q(r+t,s+t) = A(r+t,s)\ M(r+t,s+t)\ Q(r,s)$$

since

$$B(r+t,s) = A(r+t,s)\ M(r+t,s+t)$$

by assumption. Thus, $\hat{C}_P(r+t,s+t)$ and $\hat{C}_Q(r+t,s+t)$ differ only because of intercohort change in the transition from father's occupation to first job, and their difference represents the effect of that change on the net intercohort difference.

Finally, $C(r,s) = A(r,s)\ P(r,s)$, while $\hat{C}_P(r+t,s+t) = A(r+t,s)\ P(r,s)$, which differs from the first expression only by virtue of changes between cohorts in the vector of occupational origins. Thus, the difference between the terms in the third bracket is the effect on the net intercohort

difference of the intercohort shift in the distribution of sons by their fathers' occupations.

Occupational Classification in 1962 and 1972

The Current Population Survey began using occupational coding materials from the 1970 Census in January 1971 (Bregger, 1971). For that reason the observed occupation distributions in March 1972 are not directly comparable with expected occupation distributions based on the 1962 OCG data, which make use of 1960 Census occupational coding materials. To render the expected and observed distributions comparable we transformed the expected occupation distributions to a 1970 basis.

The allocation of 1960-basis occupational incumbents to 1970-basis major occupation groups was estimated by collapsing a detailed cross-classification of a sample of the 1960 experienced civilian labor force by 1960- and 1970-basis occupations (Priebe, Heinkel and Greene, 1972). Unfortunately, the 1970 occupation titles in the detailed cross-classification did not always make the distinction between salaried and self-employed status among professionals and technical workers and among managers and administrators. However, the distribution between salaried work and self-employment was given for nearly all the 1960-basis constituent titles in those groups. We allocated men in the professional and managerial groups to salaried or self-employed status in proportion to the known distribution by salaried or self-employment within the 1960-basis constituent occupation groups.

This did not entirely solve the problem of comparability. A 1967 change in the procedure for measuring class of worker increased the likelihood that a manager or administrator would be identified as salaried, rather than self-employed (Stein, 1967), while our "1970-basis"

occupation distributions incorporated a "1960-basis" distribution between salaried and self-employment. Unfortunately, available tabulations do not permit us to estimate the effect of this procedural change with any certitude. Our examination of the annual series of occupation distributions before and after the change and of unpublished tabulations from the experimental Monthly Labor Survey of 1966 has led us to conclude that the procedural change shifts about one percent of the occupation distribution from self-employment t salaried work within the managers and administrators.

Finally, our observed occupation distributions from the March 1972 CPS do not separate the salaried from the self-employed among professional and technical workers or among unemployed managers and administrators. We classified the professionals in proportion to the distribution in March 1971 and the unemployed managers in proportion to the March 1972 distribution among employed managers.

For these several reasons the components of change within the professional and managerial categories should be interpreted with great caution. We should add that the present tabulations are preliminary. When the March 1972 CPS person tape becomes available, our problems in classifying the observed distribution will be less, and we shall be able to use the black-nonblack division of the samples. Our problems in comparing the 1960- and 1970-basis occupation distributions would be reduced if the Bureau of the Census were to produce a cross-classification of the 1960-and 1970-basis major occupational groups for men which incorporated the distinction between salaried and self-employment in both classifications.

Changes in the Civilian Noninstitutional Population

Our method of computing components of intercohort change in occupation distributions assumes no movement into or out of the civilian noninstitutional population between 1962 and 1972 for cohorts covered in the 1962 OCG survey. Our results will be invalid to the degree that mortality, immigration and emigration, movement into and out of the armed forces, and changes in survey coverage are non-random with respect to occupation distributions and occupational mobility. While we have not assessed the effect of each of these sources of error, we have looked at their combined influence on the number of men in three cohorts of interest.

Table 1 about here

In Table 1 we show the numbers of white and nonwhite men in the cohorts aged 35-44, 45-54 and 55-64 in 1972, as estimated in the March 1962 OCG survey and in the March 1972 CPS. Among both whites and nonwhites there are increased numbers at the end of the decade in the youngest cohort, slightly fewer in the middle cohort, and substantially fewer in the oldest cohort. Presumably, the declining numbers in the older cohorts represent the predominant influence of mortality, while the increased numbers in the youngest cohorts reflect a return to civilian life from the armed forces.

If we take these net changes to be indicative of patterns of gross change as well, we may have reasonable confidence in the results for the two younger cohorts. The large net loss in the oldest cohorts must be viewed as a more serious threat to the validity of our calculations.

Specifically, the validity of our findings for 55-64 year olds is reduced (a) insofar as exits from the covered population between 1962 and 1972 occurred differentially with respect to occupational origins (not occupations at the survey date) and (b) insofar as changes from 1962 to 1972 in occupational mobility matrices for men in the covered population at ages 55-64 were effected by changing patterns of occupation specific exit from the covered population. We do not think that either of these sources of invalidity could be very large, but our findings for men aged 55-64 should be interpreted with caution.

Net Intercohort Occupation Shifts

The occupation distributions of white and nonwhite men aged 35-44, 45-54 and 55-64 in 1962 and in 1972 are compared in Table 2. The percentages in Table 2 and throughout the paper should be interpreted with caution, particularly in the case of nonwhites, where they are based on relatively small numbers of sample cases. For example the overall sampling fraction was about 1 in 2200 in 1962 and about 1 in 1300 in 1972, so the 1,174,000 black men aged 35-44 in 1962 are represented by about 530 cases, and the 1,163,000 men of the same age in 1972 are represented by about 890 cases. Moreover, the sampling design of the Current Population Survey is somewhat less efficient than simple random sampling.

Table 2 about here

Among nonwhite men aged 35-44 there were net shifts between 1962 and 1972 toward work as salaried professionals and, possibly, salaried managers, toward work as craftsmen and operatives, and toward absence from the labor force. At these ages there were net shifts

away from service, labor and farm work and, possibly, away from clerical and sales positions. At ages 45-54 there were shifts away from service, unskilled labor and farm work, and, possibly, self-employed managerial work. There were shifts toward salaried professional work, clerical work, skilled manual work, and absence from the labor force. At ages 55-64 the shifts were similar to those at ages 45-54.

The pattern of net shifts varies among the age-groups, partly as a function of the limited sample size, but there appears to be a common pattern of shifts away from farm, labor and service occupations and toward skilled work and professional occupations. For nonwhite men in the experienced civilian labor force the net intercohort shifts from 1962 to 1972 describe a modest upgrading of the occupational structure. At the same time there has been a greater tendency for nonwhite men to be out of the labor force, especially at ages 35-44 and 45-54, and it would be most difficult to argue that this change represents an improvement in the occupational life-chances of nonwhite men. Thus, for nonwhite men the intercohort shifts away from the lowest ranks of the occupational status hierarchy have gone partly into an increase in the numbers of higher status occupational incumbents and partly into withdrawal from the labor force.

Among white men the net intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution were more uniform across the three age groups than among nonwhites. At each age there were large net shifts away from farming and work as self-employed managers, and there were smaller shifts away from unskilled work and, except at ages 55-64, away from clerical work. There were large shifts into salaried professional and salaried managerial work and smaller shifts into sales work and skilled manual work. There was a

greater tendency for 55-64 year olds to be out of the labor force in 1972 than in 1962, perhaps indicating a pattern of earlier retirement, but in sharp contrast to the data for nonwhites there was not an increasing tendency for men to be out of the labor force at the younger ages. Taken as a whole the net intercohort shifts describe a gradual upgrading of the white occupation distribution both within and between the manual and nonmanual segments of the occupational hierarchy.

While our calculation of percentage point differences is appropriate for measuring change in the occupation distribution, it should be kept in mind that important patterns of growth or decline are represented here by small shifts in percentages. For example among nonwhites aged 35-44 the shift of 2.2 percentage points out of the category of farm laborers and foremen represents more than a 50 percent decline in the share of the occupation distribution in that category. Similarly, the modest percentage point shifts out of farming among nonwhites at every age virtually eliminate movement out of farming as a source of future net shifts in the nonwhite occupation distribution.

Components of Intercohort Shifts

In Table 3 we show components of intercohort change in the occupation distributions of white and nonwhite men which are attributable to shifts in occupational origins, changes in the relationships between occupational origins and first occupations, and changes in the relationships between first and current occupations. For example, of the 2.8 percent shift out of "farmers and farm managers" between cohorts aged 45-54 in the white population, 0.8 percent was due to intercohort changes in the occupational origins of young men, 0.3 percent to changing patterns of mobility between occupational origins and first jobs, and the

remaining 1.7 percent to changing patterns of mobility from first occupations to occupations at ages 45-54. As suggested by this example, for nonwhites and whites at every age the first two components are generally smaller than the third. That is, net intercohort shifts in the occupation distribution between 1962 and 1972 have been brought about primarily by changing relationships between first and current occupations. This finding qualifies the notion that the occupation distribution is transformed over time by the succession of cohorts, each of which has a distinctive occupation distribution, for it suggests that the unique occupational character of cohorts is not determined by distributions of occupations at entry to the labor force, but by patterns of mobility during the working ages.

Table 3 about here

These results are summarized by an array of indexes of dissimilarity in Table 4. The index of dissimilarity is the sum of positive (or negative) percentage point differences between entries in like categories of two percentage distributions, and it may be interpreted as the percentage of entries in one distribution which would have to be moved to another category in order to equate the two distributions. Since our components of change are expressed as percentage point differences, the index of dissimilarity is a natural summary measure. If intercohort shifts in the occupational structure were accomplished efficiently - in the sense that each source of occupational change moved the observed distribution in the same directions - all nonzero components of change for each occupation would be of the same sign, and the indexes of dissimilarity for

the several components of change would sum to the value of the index for total intercohort change. Thus, the indexes of dissimilarity permit us to compare the amount of occupational redistribution due to each component of intercohort change and to measure the efficiency or directness with which occupational redistribution has taken place.

Table 4 about here

For example, looking at the entries for 35-44 year old white men, we see that only a 2.2 percentage point redistribution of occupations between 1962 and 1972 is attributable to changes between cohorts in occupational origins. Similarly, a 1.8 percentage point redistribution is attributable to changes in patterns of transition from occupational origins to first occupations, but a 9.0 percentage point redistribution is due to changes in the pattern of transitions from first to current occupations. The indexes of dissimilarity for these three components of change add to 13.0, which is only 2.5 percentage points larger than the index of dissimilarity for the total intercohort shift between 1962 and 1972. Thus, the occupation shifts due to the last component of change are far larger than those of the first two, and there are relatively few conflicting components of change in the transformation of the occupation distribution from one cohort to the next. The pattern just described is replicated among whites and nonwhites at ages 45-54 and 55-64, except the indexes of dissimilarity for each component of change are almost all larger for nonwhites than for whites. We attribute the larger indexes among nonwhites in part to the greater sampling variability in the data for nonwhites.

Since there are fewer nonwhite men at older than at younger ages, it is difficult to ascribe to sampling error the relatively large indexes for the first two components of change among nonwhites at ages 35-44. Also, the third component of change - that representing modified patterns of intragenerational mobility - is greater among nonwhites aged 35-44 than any component of change in any other age-color group. While total intercohort change is also greatest among the youngest nonwhites, the sum of indexes for the three component changes is about one and two-thirds times as large as the index of total intercohort change. Thus, relative to other age-color groups among nonwhites at ages 35-44 the total intercohort change in the occupation distribution is greater, the components of change are larger, and the course of change is less direct and additive.

It is in the younger cohorts and at the younger ages that we would expect the effects of recent social changes to appear, so these findings indicate patterns of nonwhite occupational mobility may have changed within the relatively recent past. However, most men take their first jobs between ages 15 and 25, so among men aged 35-44 changes in intragenerational mobility patterns might have occurred over about a 20-year period. Lacking a comparison of these same two cohorts (aged 35-44 in 1962 and in 1972) at earlier ages, we cannot locate the changes more precisely in time.

When we compare the indexes of dissimilarity for each component of change across ages, we find different patterns for whites and nonwhites. Among whites the indexes do not appear to vary systematically by age, but among nonwhites the indexes for the transition from first job to current occupation and for total intercohort change vary inversely with

age. Thus, the pace of intercohort change in the occupation distribution appears to be faster for younger than for older nonwhites, and it is faster among nonwhites relative to whites at younger than at older ages.

If patterns of occupational mobility are changing more rapidly among younger nonwhites than whites, the direction of those changes is not very clear. We have already seen from the indexes of dissimilarity that the intercohort shifts among younger nonwhites must include conflicting components of change. Among 35 to 44 year old nonwhites changes in patterns of mobility from occupational origins to first jobs account for a 2 percentage point increase in the share of clerical workers, while changes in mobility from first jobs to current occupations account for a 2 percentage point decrease in the share of clerical workers. Shifting patterns of mobility to first jobs account for a 3.4 percentage point decrease among craftsmen and kindred workers, which is nearly offset by a 2.9 percentage point increase due to changing patterns of mobility from first to current occupations. Changing patterns of mobility from occupational origins to first jobs account for a 3.7 percentage point increase in the share of service workers, while changing patterns of mobility from first jobs to current occupations account for a 3.9 percentage point decrease. In other occupation groups the 35-44 year old nonwhites display patterns of change which are similar to those of nonwhites at other ages. We are unable to offer a cogent interpretation of the conflicting components of change in terms of either an improvement or deterioration in the occupational chances of nonwhites. Alternatively, the conflicting shifts may reflect nothing more than differential survey coverage of 25-34 year old and 35-44 year old nonwhite men in the

1962 OCG survey, but again we are unable to offer a substantive interpretation of our findings in these terms. The 1973 OCG survey, which is now in progress, should give us less ambiguous measurements of inter-cohort change in the occupational mobility of nonwhites.

White-Nonwhite Occupation Differentials

In Table 5 we show percentage point differences between the white and nonwhite occupation distributions by age in 1962 and 1972. A positively signed difference indicates a greater share of whites than of nonwhites in an occupation group. The color differentials are generally consistent across ages and between 1962 and 1972. At both points of time and at each age whites were more likely than nonwhites to be professional, managerial and sales workers, craftsmen and farmers and farm managers. Nonwhites were consistently more likely to be operatives, service workers, nonfarm or farm laborers, and to be out of the labor force. Only among clerical workers was there less than perfect consistency and persistence in the color differentials. There, nonwhites were more heavily represented than whites at ages 35-44 in both years and at age 45-54 in 1972, and whites were more heavily represented at ages 45-54 in 1962 and at ages 55-64 in 1962 and 1972.

Table 5 about here

Table 5 also shows changes in the percentage point differences between whites and nonwhites from 1962 to 1972 for each occupation at each age. In occupation categories where whites are over-represented a negative change indicates increasing similarity in the occupation distributions of whites and nonwhites, and in categories where nonwhites

are more heavily represented, a positive change indicates increasing similarity. At every age the color differential decreased by at least a small amount among salaried professionals, self-employed managers, clerical workers, craftsmen, service workers and farm and nonfarm laborers, while the differentials increased at every age among salaried managers and sales workers. With the exception of salaried professionals, the occupation groups where the color differential narrowed were growing slowly or declining in relative numbers among whites, while the two groups where the differential widened were both increasing in relative numbers among whites. Thus, since nonwhites are in the minority, they appear to have moved closest to equality with whites in those occupation groups where the relative numbers of men are stable or declining.

Aside from the possible convergence between the percentages of whites and nonwhites in the several occupation groups, the changes in white-nonwhite differentials also indicate shifts in the relative numbers of whites and nonwhites. In occupation groups where the percentage point differences are negative, the share of nonwhites has increased relative to that of whites, and, conversely, positive differences indicate increasing relative shares of whites. At every age the representation of nonwhites relative to whites increased among salaried professionals, among self-employed managers, and among craftsmen. The percentages of salaried professionals and of craftsmen were growing among whites and nonwhites, but more rapidly among nonwhites. The share of proprietors was falling rapidly among whites, but it was stable or declining slowly among nonwhites. The representation of nonwhites also increased relative to whites among clerks at ages 45-54 and 55-64, where the relative numbers of whites were stable while those of nonwhites increased. White

stability and nonwhite growth also led to the relative growth of nonwhite operatives at ages 35-44 and to increases in the relative numbers of nonwhites out of the labor force at ages 35-44 and 45-54.

White representation among salaried managers increased at every age even though the percentage of salaried managers increased among nonwhites at ages 35-44 and 45-54. The relative share of white salesmen also increased because the white percentages increased slightly while the nonwhite percentages grew slowly, if at all. With a single exception the shares of white service workers, farm and nonfarm laborers, and farmers grew relative to those of nonwhites. In all but one of these low status groups (white service workers), the percentages of both whites and of nonwhites fell at every age. The nonwhite percentages decreased more, so the share of whites increased relative to that of nonwhites. Finally, there was a shift away from labor force participation at ages 55-64 among both whites and nonwhites but the shift was greater for whites. Thus, the share of whites outside the labor force increased relative to that of nonwhites, and, obversely, the share of nonwhites in the labor force increased relative to that of whites.

These changing color differentials defy description in terms of a simple pattern of convergence or of movement of nonwhites into higher status occupations. White representation increased relative to that of nonwhites in the four lowest status occupation groups, yet nonwhites increased relative to whites among persons outside the labor force at younger ages and among persons still in the labor force at older ages. Likewise, the situation of nonwhites improved relative to that of whites in some higher status occupations (salaried professionals, self-employed managers, clerks, and craftsmen), but not in others (salaried managers and salesmen).

The color differentials at each age and year are summarized by the indexes of dissimilarity at the base of each column of Table 5. For example, at ages 35-44 in 1962 32.4 percent of whites would have had to change major occupation groups to equate the white and nonwhite occupation distributions. The striking fact given by these indexes is that the degree of convergence between the white and nonwhite occupation distributions between 1962 and 1972 was greater at the older than the younger ages. About a fourth of the dissimilarity of white and nonwhite occupation distributions was eliminated at ages 55-64 over the decade, but at ages 35-44 the dissimilarity was greater in 1972 than in 1962. In 1962 the indexes of dissimilarity varied directly with age, suggesting the possibility that color differentials might narrow with the succession of cohorts, but by 1972 this pattern had disappeared. This lack of convergence is complemented by the decreasing similarity of whites and nonwhites in the cohort aged 35-44 in 1962 and 45-54 in 1972, but the color differentials did narrow in the next older cohort from an index of 41.6 in 1962 to one of 31.6 in 1972.

Components of Change in Color Differentials

Table 6 gives an accounting of the intercohort changes in color differentials in terms of the components of change developed above. For example, at ages 45-54 the convergence of 5.5 percentage points in the percentage of nonfarm laborers is composed of 0.8 percentage points due to intercohort shifts in occupational origin differentials between whites and nonwhites, 0.4 percentage points due to shifting differentials in mobility to first jobs, and 4.3 percentage points due to shifting differentials in mobility between first and current occupations.

Tables 6 and 7 about here

Rather than explicating these components in detail, we summarize the results at each age with the sums of positive percentage point differences reported in Table 7. The entries in Table 7 may be interpreted like the indexes of dissimilarity reported above, except they are computed from differences between percentage point differences, rather than differences between percentage points. As in the case of intercohort changes within each racial group, the largest contribution to changing racial differentials in occupations is made by changing differences between whites and nonwhites in mobility from first to current occupations. At each age that component is about as large as the total intercohort change over the decade. As in the case of the intercohort changes among nonwhites, the components of intercohort change in the color differentials are closer to being additive at ages 45-54 and 55-64 than at ages 35-44. In the youngest age group there were substantially greater shifts in color differentials due to the three components of change than would have been required at a minimum to effect the intercohort shifts in occupational differences between white and nonwhite men. As in the case of the large components of intercohort change within the nonwhite population at ages 35-44, we are unable to offer a detailed interpretation of our findings. We expect they will be modified and/or explained as the data from our replicate of the 1962 OCG survey become available.

Whites in 1962 and Nonwhites in 1972

In the light of the apparent, if modest, changes in the white and nonwhite transition matrices since 1962 we thought it would be instructive to ask whether the 1972 transition matrices for nonwhite men gave them better occupational chances than the 1962 matrices for white men of the

same age. Thus, we applied the 1962 transition matrices for white men to the occupational origin vectors of nonwhite men of appropriate ages in the 1962 survey. Using these hypothetical destination vectors, we carried out an analysis of intercohort change among nonwhites parallel to our earlier analyses of intercohort change among whites and nonwhites. The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8 about here

At each age the first component represents the difference between an observed destination vector of an earlier nonwhite cohort and the expected destination vector for a later nonwhite cohort based on the intergenerational transition matrix of an earlier white cohort. At every age the combination of the later nonwhite origin vector and earlier white transition matrix generates upward shifts in the percentages of professionals, managers, craftsmen and farmers, and it generates downward shifts in the percentages of service workers, farm and nonfarm laborers, and men outside the labor force. The substantial size of these first components of change is indicated by the indexes of dissimilarity, each 30 or larger, between observed and expected distributions. These indexes are much larger than any index describing an actual intercohort shift or component thereof among either whites or nonwhites. Comparing these results with the actual decompositions for nonwhites of the same ages in Table 3, we see the nonwhite distribution would have shifted far more toward high status occupation categories and away from low status occupation categories - especially service and nonfarm labor - if later cohorts of nonwhites had enjoyed the intergenerational mobility chances of earlier cohorts of whites.

The second component of change at each age represents differences between the expected destination vectors based on nonwhite origins and first job distributions and the corresponding white intergenerational and intragenerational mobility matrices. Here, the components of change are rather small, as in the case of the earlier decompositions, and they have no consistent tendency either to upgrade or to downgrade the occupation distributions.

The third component of change represents differences between the observed occupation distribution for a later cohort of nonwhites and the distribution expected from the first job distribution of that cohort and the intragenerational mobility pattern of an earlier cohort of whites. As in the case of the first component of change, the shifts are quite large, and they generally are similar in size and opposite in effect from the shifts due to the first component of change. This is what we should expect if the white intragenerational mobility matrix gives greater opportunities than the nonwhite matrix for men to enter or remain in high status occupations. Thus, the shifts are consistent across ages in reducing the percentages of nonwhites who are self-employed professionals, salaried or self-employed managers, sales workers, craftsmen, and farmers. They are consistent in increasing the percentages of nonwhites who are clerical workers, operatives, service workers, farm and nonfarm laborers, and who are not in the labor force. The nonwhite occupation distribution at each age would have undergone a massive shift in the direction of higher status occupations if later cohorts of nonwhites had enjoyed the intragenerational mobility patterns of earlier cohorts of whites.

The results of this set of hypothetical calculations are unmistakably clear. If cohorts of nonwhites aged 35 to 64 in 1972 had enjoyed the occupational mobility chances of white men of the same age a decade earlier, there would have been a massive upgrading of the occupational distribution of nonwhites between 1962 and 1972. In the actual succession of nonwhite cohorts the shifts in the occupation distribution have been modest in size and character. The observed chances of nonwhites to move out of service, labor or farm work and into salaried professional work, salaried managerial work and skilled manual work have improved, but not nearly to the extent indicated in our hypothetical calculations. At the same time there has been an increase in the chance that a nonwhite man in the prime working ages will neither hold a job nor be looking for one, and it is not clear that the white and nonwhite occupation distributions are converging. From all of this it seems clear that in 1972 as in 1962 the occupational disadvantages of nonwhite men must be attributed to unfavorable patterns of occupational mobility throughout their careers, not to their impoverished social origins.

REFERENCES

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan

1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Bregger, John E.

1971 "Revisions in Occupational Classifications for 1971," Employment and Earnings (February):5-8. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Duncan, Otis Dudley

1965 "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review 30 (August):491-498.

1968 "Patterns of Occupational Mobility among Negro Men," Demography 5:11-22.

Farley, Reynolds and Albert Hermalin

1972 "The 1960's: A Decade of Progress for Blacks?" Demography 9 (August):353-370.

Featherman, David L. and Robert M. Hauser

1973 "Design for a Replicate Study of Social Mobility in the United States," in Social Indicator Models, edited by Kenneth C. Land and Seymour Spilerman (forthcoming). Presently available as Working Paper 72-6, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Ginzberg, Eli and Dale L. Hiestand

1968 Mobility in the Negro Community: Guidelines for Research on Social and Economic Progress (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication No. 11). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Hauser, Robert M. and David L. Featherman

1972 "Trends in Occupational Mobility, 1962-1970," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Sections, 1972. Washington, D.C.: American Statistical Association. Also available as Working Paper 72-9, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, Madison. (Forthcoming in American Sociological Review, June, 1973.)

Lieberson, Stanley and Glenn V. Fuguitt

1967 "Negro-White Occupational Differences in the Absence of Discrimination," American Journal of Sociology 73 (September): 188-200.

Stein, Robert L.

1967 "New Definitions for Employment and Unemployment," Employment and Earnings and Monthly Report on the Labor Force 13 (February):1-25.

Thurow, Lester

1972 "Education and Economic Equality," The Public Interest 28 (Summer):66-81.

U. S. Bureau of the Census

1972 1970 Occupation and Industry Classification Systems in Terms of Their 1960 Occupation and Industry Elements, by John A. Priebe, Joan Heinkel and Stanley Greene (Technical Paper No. 26). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

1972 Black Americans: A Decade of Occupational Change (BLS Bulletin 1731). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

TABLE 1

ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF MEN IN SELECTED COHORTS BY COLOR: U. S. MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, MARCH 1962 AND MARCH 1972

Age in 1972	35-44	45-54	55-64
	Nonwhite		
March 1962	1146	1174	967
March 1972	1163	1093	802
Percent change 1962-1972	1.5%	-6.9%	-17.1%
	White		
March 1962	9467	10434	9194
March 1972	9577	10075	8044
Percent change 1962-1972	1.2%	-3.4%	-12.5%

Source: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation survey (person tapes) and March 1972 Current Population Survey. Estimated frequencies are in thousands.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY OCCUPATION AND NET CHANGE, 1962-1972, BY AGE BY COLOR: U. S. MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, MARCH 1962 AND MARCH 1972

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
			Nonwhite						
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.1	-0.1
Salaried	4.0	8.9	4.9	1.6	4.9	3.3	2.0	3.2	1.2
Managers and administrators, except farm									
Salaried	2.5	4.0	1.5	1.6	2.6	1.0	2.6	1.7	-0.9
Self-employed	2.5	2.1	-0.4	3.6	1.3	-2.3	1.7	1.9	0.2
Sales workers	2.1	1.3	-0.8	0.9	0.8	-0.1	0.0	1.0	1.0
Clerical and kindred workers	6.6	6.1	-0.5	3.5	7.2	3.7	2.4	4.0	1.6
Craftsmen and kindred workers	13.6	15.1	1.5	9.9	13.4	3.5	6.5	11.1	4.6
Operatives, including transport workers	19.1	27.1	8.0	20.5	21.2	0.7	16.2	16.0	-0.2
Service workers, including private household	12.7	11.0	-1.7	15.9	13.6	-2.3	18.1	16.7	-1.4
Laborers, except farm	21.9	13.4	-8.5	22.5	16.6	-5.9	17.6	16.0	-1.6
Farmers and farm managers	4.7	0.3	-4.4	5.2	1.3	-3.9	4.4	1.9	-2.5
Farm laborers and foremen	4.2	2.0	-2.2	3.6	2.5	-1.1	6.4	3.4	-3.0
Not in experienced civilian labor force	5.8	8.2	2.4	10.8	14.1	3.3	21.9	23.0	1.1
Total	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
Number (1,000)	1174	1163		967	1093		686	802	

(continued)

TABLE 2--Continued

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
				White					
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	1.9	1.9	0.0	1.5	2.0	0.5	1.6	1.5	-0.1
Salaried	10.7	14.5	3.8	7.5	10.4	2.9	6.5	6.8	0.3
Managers and administrators, except farm									
Salaried	10.3	14.0	3.7	8.8	12.9	4.1	9.1	10.3	1.2
Self-employed	7.9	3.4	-4.5	10.1	3.3	-6.8	9.5	3.8	-5.7
Sales workers	5.3	6.3	1.0	5.2	6.3	1.1	3.8	5.2	1.4
Clerical and kindred workers	6.0	5.7	-0.3	6.4	6.2	-0.2	5.2	5.3	0.1
Craftsmen and kindred workers	21.3	22.6	1.3	22.6	23.3	0.7	18.3	19.1	0.8
Operatives, including transport workers	17.0	16.2	-0.8	15.3	16.2	0.9	12.9	13.5	0.6
Service workers, including private household	4.2	4.9	0.7	5.4	5.4	0.0	6.1	6.7	0.6
Laborers, except farm	5.2	3.9	-1.3	4.8	4.4	-0.4	4.7	3.9	-0.8
Farmers and farm managers	4.7	2.6	-2.1	6.2	3.4	-2.8	8.3	4.5	-3.8
Farm laborers and foremen	1.1	0.8	-0.3	1.2	0.6	-0.6	1.4	1.1	-0.3
Not in experienced civilian labor force	4.4	3.2	-1.2	5.0	5.6	0.6	12.6	18.3	5.7
Total	100.0	100.0	(10.5)	100.0	100.0	(10.8)	100.0	100.0	(10.7)
Number (1,000)	10434	9577		9194	10075		6898	8044	

Source: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation survey and March 1972 Current Population Survey (unpublished Bureau of Labor Statistics tabulations).

TABLE 3

COMPONENTS OF INTERCOHORT CHANGE IN OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTIONS BY AGE AND COLOR: U. S. MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, MARCH 1962 AND MARCH 1972

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
				Nonwhite					
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	-0.1	0.4	-0.1	0.0	0.4	-0.3	0.1	0.0	-0.2
Salaried	0.8	-0.4	4.5	-0.2	0.5	3.0	0.3	-0.3	1.2
Managers and administrators, except farm									
Salaried	-0.4	1.0	0.9	-0.3	0.2	1.1	-0.1	-0.2	-0.6
Self-employed	-0.1	0.0	-0.3	0.8	0.9	-4.0	-0.2	0.2	0.2
Sales workers	0.6	-0.7	-0.7	0.0	0.4	-0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0
Clerical and kindred workers	-0.6	2.1	-2.0	0.2	0.1	3.4	0.0	-0.4	2.0
Craftsmen and kindred workers	2.0	-3.4	2.9	-0.7	0.7	3.5	0.2	-0.3	4.7
Operatives, including transport workers	0.9	-0.7	7.8	0.4	-0.3	0.6	1.1	-0.9	-0.4
Service workers, including private household	-1.5	3.7	-3.9	0.4	-1.5	-1.2	1.3	-1.4	-1.3
Laborers, except farm	-0.4	-0.4	-7.7	-0.9	-0.5	-4.5	-0.6	1.4	-2.4
Farmers and farm managers	-1.0	-0.5	-2.9	-0.6	-0.1	-3.2	0.1	-0.1	-2.5
Farm laborers and foremen	-0.1	-0.9	-1.2	-0.2	0.1	-1.0	-0.6	0.4	-2.8
Not in experienced civilian labor force	-0.1	-0.2	2.7	1.1	-0.9	3.1	-1.6	1.6	1.1

(continued)

TABLE 3--Continued

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
			White						
rofessional, technical, nd kindred workers									
Self-employed	0.2	0.4	-0.6	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	-0.1	0.0
Salaried	1.0	0.7	2.1	0.5	0.5	1.9	0.3	-0.4	0.4
anagers and administrators, xcept farm									
Salaried	0.4	0.4	2.9	0.4	-0.4	4.1	0.3	0.0	0.9
Self-employed	-0.1	0.2	-4.6	0.1	0.4	-7.3	0.0	0.5	-6.2
ales workers	0.2	-0.2	1.0	0.1	-0.2	1.2	0.3	-0.1	1.2
lerical and kindred workers	0.2	-0.3	-0.2	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.2	-0.3	0.2
raftsmen and kindred orkers	-0.3	-0.5	2.1	-0.1	0.6	0.2	-0.1	0.4	0.5
peratives, including ransport workers	-0.4	-0.6	0.2	-0.1	-0.1	1.1	0.2	0.0	0.4
ervice wo.kers, includ-ng private household	0.1	-0.1	0.7	0.0	-0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.5
aborers, except farm	-0.1	0.0	-1.2	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	-0.7
armers and farm managers	-1.1	0.1	-1.1	-0.8	-0.3	-1.7	-1.1	0.1	-2.8
arm laborers and foremen	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.4	-0.1	0.0	-0.2
ot in experienced ivilian labor force	0.1	-0.1	-1.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	-0.1	0.0	5.8

ource: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation survey and March 1972 Current Popula-ion Survey (unpublished Bureau of Labor Statistics tabulations).

ote: Components are (1) changes in occupational origin; (2) changes in the transition from ather's occupation to first job; and (3) changes in the transition from first job to current ccupation.

TABLE 4

INDEXES OF DISSIMILARITY REPRESENTING COMPONENTS OF INTERCOHORT CHANGE IN OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTIONS BY AGE AND COLOR: U. S. MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, MARCH 1962 AND MARCH 1972

Component of intercohort change	35-44	45-54	55-64
Nonwhite			
Occupational origin	4.3	2.9	3.1
Transition from father's occupation to first job	7.2	3.3	3.6
Transition from first job to current occupation	18.8	14.7	10.2
Sum of components	30.3	20.9	16.9
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	18.5	15.6	9.7
White			
Occupational origin	2.2	1.2	1.4
Transition from father's occupation to first job	1.8	1.5	1.0
Transition from first job to current occupation	9.0	9.7	9.9
Sum of components	13.0	12.4	12.3
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	10.5	10.8	10.7

Source: Tables 2 and 3.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE POINT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE WHITE AND NONWHITE OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTIONS BY AGE: U. S. MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, MARCH 1962 AND MARCH 1972

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change	1962	1972	Change
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	1.6	1.4	-0.2	1.1	1.5	0.4	1.4	1.4	0.0
Salaried	6.7	5.6	-1.1	5.9	5.5	-0.4	4.5	3.6	-0.9
Managers and administrators, except farm									
Salaried	7.8	10.0	2.2	7.2	10.3	3.1	6.5	8.6	2.1
Self-employed	5.4	1.3	-4.1	6.5	2.0	-4.5	7.8	1.9	-5.9
Sales workers	3.2	5.0	1.8	4.3	5.5	1.2	3.8	4.2	0.4
Clerical and kindred workers	-0.6	-0.4	0.2	2.9	-1.0	-3.9	2.8	1.3	-1.5
Craftsmen and kindred workers	7.7	7.5	-0.2	12.7	9.9	-2.8	11.8	8.0	-3.8
Operatives, including transport workers	-2.1	-10.9	-8.8	-5.2	-5.0	0.2	-3.3	-2.5	0.8
Service workers, including private household	-8.5	-6.1	2.4	-10.5	-8.2	2.3	-12.0	-10.0	2.0
Laborers, except farm	-16.7	-9.5	7.2	-17.7	-12.2	5.5	-12.9	-12.1	0.8
Farmers and farm managers	0.0	2.3	2.3	1.0	2.1	1.1	3.9	2.6	-1.3
Farm laborers and foremen	-3.1	-1.2	1.9	-2.4	-1.9	0.5	-5.0	-2.3	2.7
Not in experienced civilian labor force	-1.4	-5.0	-3.6	-5.8	-8.5	-2.7	-9.3	-4.7	4.6
Index of dissimilarity	32.4	33.1	18.0	41.6	36.8	14.3	42.5	31.6	13.4

Source: Table 2.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE POINT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WHITE AND NONWHITE COMPONENTS OF INTERCOHORT CHANGE IN OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTIONS BY AGE: U. S. MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, MARCH 1962 AND MARCH 1972

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	0.3	0.0	-0.5	0.0	-0.4	0.8	-0.1	-0.1	0.2
Salaried	0.2	1.1	-2.4	0.7	0.0	-1.1	0.0	-0.1	-0.8
Managers and administrators, except farm									
Salaried	0.8	-0.6	2.0	0.7	-0.6	3.0	0.4	0.2	1.5
Self-employed	0.0	0.2	-4.3	-0.7	-0.5	-3.3	0.2	0.3	-6.4
Sales workers	-0.4	0.5	1.7	0.1	-0.6	1.7	0.3	-0.1	0.2
Clerical and kindred workers	0.8	-2.4	1.8	-0.1	-0.3	-3.5	0.2	0.1	-1.8
Craftsmen and kindred workers	-2.3	2.9	-0.8	0.6	-0.1	-3.3	-0.3	0.7	-4.2
Operatives, including transport workers	-1.3	0.1	-7.6	-0.5	0.2	0.5	-0.9	0.9	0.8
Service workers, including private household	1.6	-3.8	4.6	-0.4	1.4	1.3	-1.2	1.4	1.8
Laborers, except farm	0.3	0.4	6.5	0.8	0.4	4.3	0.6	-1.5	1.7
Farmers and farm managers	-0.1	0.6	1.8	-0.2	-0.2	1.5	-1.2	0.2	-0.3
Farm laborers and foremen	-0.1	0.9	1.1	0.1	-0.2	0.6	0.5	-0.4	2.6
Not in experienced civilian labor force	0.2	0.1	-3.9	-1.1	0.9	-2.5	1.5	-1.6	4.7

Source: Table 3.

Note: Components are (1) changes in occupational origin; (2) changes in the transition from father's occupation to first job; and (3) changes in the transition from first job to current occupation.

TABLE 7

SUMS OF POSITIVE PERCENTAGE POINT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WHITE AND NONWHITE COMPONENTS OF CHANGE IN OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTIONS BY AGE: U. S. MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION, MARCH 1962 AND MARCH 1972

Component of intercohort change	35-44	45-54	55-64
Occupational origin	4.2	3.0	3.7
Transition from father's occupation to first job	6.8	2.9	3.8
Transition from first job to current occupation	19.5	13.7	13.5
Sum of components	30.5	19.6	21.0
Total intercohort change, 1962-1972	18.0	14.3	13.4

Source: Tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 8

HYPOTHETICAL COMPONENTS OF CHANGE, 1962-1972, IN THE NONWHITE OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTION BY AGE BASED ON TRANSITION MATRICES OF WHITE MEN IN THE CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION IN 1962

Occupation	35-44			45-54			55-64		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Professional, technical, and kindred workers									
Self-employed	0.9	0.6	-1.3	0.3	0.0	-0.2	0.8	-0.3	-0.6
Salaried	4.9	-0.4	0.4	3.4	0.3	-0.4	2.9	-1.8	0.1
Managers and administrators, except farm									
Salaried	5.8	-0.2	-4.1	4.6	0.7	-4.3	4.7	-0.5	-5.1
Self-employed	4.7	0.3	-5.4	5.4	-0.6	-7.1	6.4	1.3	-7.5
Sales workers	4.1	-0.5	-4.4	5.3	-0.9	-4.5	5.7	-2.4	-2.3
Clerical and kindred workers	-2.6	0.2	1.9	0.6	-0.1	3.2	0.7	-0.7	1.6
Craftsmen and kindred workers	8.4	0.0	-6.9	14.5	-0.2	-10.8	11.7	0.9	-8.0
Operatives, including transport workers	0.5	-0.6	8.1	-3.6	-0.1	4.4	-2.2	1.1	0.9
Service workers, including private household	-7.7	0.5	5.5	-9.7	0.9	6.5	-11.0	0.4	9.2
Laborers, except farm	-15.3	-0.7	7.5	-15.7	-0.8	10.6	-11.3	0.1	9.6
Farmers and farm managers	0.7	-0.7	-4.4	2.3	-0.1	-6.1	5.5	1.0	-9.0
Farm laborers and foremen	-2.8	-0.2	0.8	-2.0	-0.1	1.0	-4.7	0.4	1.3
Not in experienced civilian labor force	-1.6	1.7	2.3	-5.4	1.0	7.7	-9.2	0.5	9.8
Index of dissimilarity	30.0	3.3	26.5	36.4	2.9	33.4	38.4	5.7	32.5

Source: March 1962 Occupational Changes in a Generation survey and March 1972 Current Population Survey (unpublished Bureau of Labor Statistics tabulations).

Note: Components are (1) changes in occupational origin; (2) changes in the transition from father's occupation to first job; and (3) changes in the transition from first job to current occupation.